

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-1562**

---

J.A.,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

---

Submitted: March 8, 2016

Decided: April 1, 2016

---

Before KING, FLOYD, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

W. Rob Heroy, GOODMAN, CARR PLLC, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Petitioner. Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Anthony P. Nicastro, Acting Assistant Director, Tracey N. McDonald, Office of Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

J.A., a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's denial of his application for cancellation of removal. For the reasons set forth below, we dismiss the petition for review.

Under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(i) (2012), entitled "Denials of discretionary relief," "no court shall have jurisdiction to review any judgment regarding the granting of relief under section . . . 1229b," which is the section governing cancellation of removal. In this case, the agency found that J.A. failed to establish that he had been a person of good moral character for the requisite statutory period or that he merited a grant of cancellation of removal as a matter of discretion. We conclude that these determinations are clearly discretionary in nature, and we therefore lack jurisdiction to review challenges to the agency's denial of relief absent a colorable constitutional claim or question of law.

We have reviewed J.A.'s claims of error and conclude that he fails to raise a colorable constitutional claim or question of law under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D) (2012). We therefore dismiss the petition for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are

adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DISMISSED